DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 646 UD 017 161

AUTHOR Weitzner, Martin
TITLE Central ESEA Title I Remedial Services for Eligible Nonpublic School Pupils: English as a Second Language.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 28p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-69629

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Language Skills; *Oral English; *Private Schools; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The Nonpublic School Program English as a Second Language was designed to provide remedial instruction in the English language with emphasis on oral English for those eligible non-English speaking pupils enrolled in Title I nonpublic schools. It operated in 89 schools and served over three thousand pupils in grades kindergarten through twelve. The program's major objective was that of enabling pupils in the program to achieve statistically significant improvement in their English language competency and fluency. The program provided language experiences employing an audiolingual approach to small groups of students, ranging in numbers of four to eight. These pupils received instruction for approximately 45 minutes a day, and for between two and five days per week. A wide variety of learning materials and audiovisual equipment was employed by the program. The program administrators provided ongoing training which tied the various program elements together. In addition, the operation of an exchange center provided teachers with an opportunity to become familiar with a wide array of materials and to exchange materials which were not specifically appropriate for their students with those which were. Test results for participating pupils demonstrated that students at all grade levels experienced statistically significant gains. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EVALUATION REPORT

ED142646

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CENTRAL ESEA TITLE I REMEDIAL SERVICES FOR ELIGIBLE NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS: ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

FUNCTION #09-69629

SCHOOL YEAR 1975 - 1976

PREPARED BY MARTIN WEITZNER, Ph.D.

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year.

CD017161

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Program Description	1
Program Objectives	2
Evaluation Objective #1	2
Methods and Procedures	
Data Analysis	
Time Schedule	
Evaluation Objective #2	3
Methods and Procedures	
Findings	4
Evaluation Objective #1	
Data Collection	
Limitations on Data Analysis	
Data Analysis	
Test Results	
Tables I and II	6
Evaluation Objective #2	7
Implementation	
Staff	
Facilities	
Materials and Equipment	8
Instruction	9
Pupil Participants	10
Supervision and Training	11
Recommendations 1974-1975	12
Summary of Major Findings	13
Conclusions	15
Recommendations 1975-1976	15
Appendices	
Data Loss Form	18
Section II MIR	20
Program Abstract	22

1. Program Description

The Nonpublic School Program English As a Second Language was designed to provide remedial instruction in the English language with emphasis on oral English for those eligible non-English speaking pupils enrolled in Title I nonpublic schools.

The program's major objective was that of enabling pupils in the English As a Second Language (ESL) program to achieve statistically significant improvement in their English language competency and fluency. In addition, the program had as its objective facilitation of grade achievement levels for pupils participating in the program. The program provided language experiences employing an audiolingual approach to small groups of students, ranging in number from four to eight. These pupils received instruction for approximately forty-five minutes a day, and for between two and five days per week. A wide variety of learning materials and audiovisual equipment was employed by the program.

The program was implemented during the period September, 1975 through June, 1976 in eighty-nine nonpublic schools. The program called for providing services to some three thousand pupils in grades kindergarten through twelve.

Pupils were selected for program participation on the basis of referrals from classroom teachers, guidance counsellors and principals at their home schools. In addition, to determine pupil eligibility, the ESL teachers administered, as a screening device, the total auditory test of the Stanford Achievement Test, as well as an oral proficiency test, to each pupil referred to the program. This approach was employed to ascertain each pupil's need for ESL instruction.

II. Program Objectives

1. The program's major objective was that of enabling pupils in the English As a Second Language (ESL) Program to achieve statistically significant improvement in their English language competency and fluency.

III. Evaluation Objective #1

To determine if, as a result of participation in the ESL Program there was statistically significant improvement in participating pupils' receptive language skills.

1.1 Subjects: All subjects in the ESL Program in grades kindergarten through nine.

1.2 Methods and Procedures: The Test of Basic Experience (TOBE), which was administered as a pre-test during the fall of 1975 and as a post-test during the spring (April) of 1976, to all participants at the kindergarten and first grade levels. The total auditory test of the 1974 Stanford Achievement Test was administered as a pre-test in October, 1975 and again as a post-test during April, 1976. The primary level, form A, was utilized for pupils in grades two through eight, and the intermediate level, form A, for participants in grades nine through twelve. As a post-test, the same instrument and levels were utilized, but form B was administered for the post-test. It should be noted that some pupils were pre-tested in October, 1975. For other pupils, who had previously participated and for whom the test level was still appropriate, April 1975 test data was utilized. In addition, as services expanded during the year, incoming pupils were tested at various dates.

1.3 Data Analysis: Data will be analyzed with the "Pre-test/Post-test (Without Controls)" design. The difference between raw score means will be tested for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated

t test.

1.4 Time Schedule: The pre-test will be administered at the end of September, 1975 and the post-test at the end of May, 1976.

IV. Evaluation Objective #2

To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal. In the evaluation report, the evaluator-consultant must make a statement concerning the extent of this implementation and, where serious discrepancies exist between proposal and program, provide a description of discrepancies.

2.1 Methods and Procedures: In order to determine the extent to which the program was implemented, the consultant visited twenty of the eighty-nine participating schools involved in the program. A list of these schools was assigned to the evaluator by the director of the nonpublic school programs, and one can ascertain the extent to which these schools represent a random selection of the schools in the program. Two half-day visits were made to each of these twenty schools. The first visit was considered a pre-visit and the second visit a post-visit. Pre-visits were made during the fall and winter of 1975 and post-visits during the spring of 1975. During each visit, a minimum of two classroom observations were conducted, as well as interviews with the ESL teachers and principals. In addition to meeting with ESL teachers and principals, the evaluator had an opportunity, on a number of occasions, to meet with other Title I and regular classroom teachers, as well as the program coordinator and one of two field supervisors.

V. Findings

Evaluation Objective #1

1.1 Data Collection: All test data was collected, as requested by the consultant, by the ESL teachers and submitted to him. [Test data was picked up during the last week of May and collected for thirty-five hundred and four pupils. Of this number, pre and post-test data were available for thirty-two hundred and thirty-three.

1.2 Limitations on Data Analysis: While data was collected for thirty-five hundred and four pupils, matched pre and post-test scores were available for thirty-two hundred and thirty-three of these pupils]. Both pre and post-test scores were not available for approximately two hundred fifty pupils. The major reason for loss of data was the fact that pupils moved out from the program school. Other reasons which occurred with less frequency were withdrawal of pupils from the program, late entry into the program, and recording errors with regard to the data. (See data loss sheet.)

1.3 Data Analysis: All data were punched on to IBM cards and then analyzed, using a correlated t test for each grade level, as well as for participants at group grade levels such as grades four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, etc.

1.4 Test Results: Table I shows the pre-test and post-test scores for program participants in grades one and two on the Test of Basic Experiences. A total of 323 kindergarten pupils had pre and post-test scores on the Test of Basic Experiences. The pre-test mean score was 9.4 and the post-test mean score 15.1. This gave a difference of 5.7 and a t value of 15.36, which was statistically significant at less than .001 level. In grade one, a total of 943 pupils had pre and post-test scores. The pre-test mean was 15.4, the post-test mean 21.8, the difference 5.4. This yielded a t value

of 39.48, which is significant beyond the .001 level. As may be noted, pupils in grades one and two made statistically significant gains over the course of program participation, as measured by their pre/post-test scores.

Table II gives pre and post-test grade equivalents on the Stanford Achievement Test Total Auditory Test for pupils in grades one, two and three; four, five and six; seven, eight and nine; and ten, eleven and twelve. As may be noted from Table II, at all grade levels there were statistically significant gains achieved by pupils participating in the program. The average gain for pupils in grade one was four months, for those in grades two and three an average gain of six months. Pupils in grades four, five and six experienced an average gain of eight months; those in grades seven, eight and nine seven months, and finally, those in grades ten, eleven, and twelve twelve months.

The test data provided in Tables I and II clearly suggest that the program was successful in achieving the stated objective of facilitating pupil performance as measured by pre and post-test scores over the course of program participation.

Separate analyses of 1. the impact of supplementary paraprofessional services and 2. the Russian immigrant population were not conducted since in both instances the Ns were extremely small and did not lend themselves to appropriate statistical treatment.

TABLE I

Pre - Post Test Scores

Test of Basic Experiences

Grades Kindergarten and One

Grade	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Difference	t Value	p Value
Kindergarten	323	9.4	15.1	5.7	15.36	< .001
One	943	15.4	21.8	5.4	39.48	< .001

TABLE II

Pre and Post - Test Scores in Grade Equivalents

The Stanford Achievement Test, Total Auditory Test

Grades 1; 2 and 3; 4, 5 and 6; 7, 8 and 9; 10, 11 and 12

Grade	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Difference	t Value	p Value
1	46	0.7	1.1	0.4	2.93	< .05
2 & 3	924	1.2	1.8	0.6	33.59	< .001
4, 5, 6	748	1.9	2.7	0.8	36.19	< .001
7, 8, 9	214	2.5	3.2	0.7	10.67	< .001
10, 11, 12	35	4.0	5.2	1.2	3.82	< .001

VI. Evaluation Objective #2

The second objective of the current program is concerned with the extent to which program implementation followed program guidelines.

2.1 Implementation: The ESL Program operated in 89 schools during the course of the program year. Implementation occurred promptly and fully. The only difficulty in achieving program implementation related to the fiscal crisis in New York City with the attendant difficulties in personnel assignment.

2.2 Staff: The ESL Program was staffed by teachers who appeared qualified and conscientious. Most of the teachers had been in the program for several years. In the schools visited, with few exceptions, teachers had been working there during previous years and were familiar with the setting and the regular classroom teachers at that site.

This consultant had an opportunity to meet with one of the field supervisors, who seemed particularly well qualified and knowledgeable regarding the program and its implementation. The field supervisors conducted the orientation sessions, workshops and staff meetings during the course of the program year. Teachers were visited on a regular ongoing basis by field supervisors, who assisted them in diagnosis, planning, classroom methods and with regard to the utilization of new learning materials.

The program was directed by a project coordinator who had many years of experience, was extremely capable and efficient in working with the field supervisors, teachers assigned and program sites.

2.3 Facilities: Among the twenty schools visited, this observer noted that, in roughly ninety percent of the sites seen, classrooms were of sufficient size and location to meet the needs of the program. Ventilation and

lighting were generally good and, in every instance, the program staff had taken special pains to make the rooms as attractive as possible through the use of posters, students' work and other decorative techniques. Teachers had materials relating to the appropriate season of the year. Special events such as Thanksgiving and Puerto Rican Discovery Day were also highlighted. Materials and equipment, for the most part, were readily accessible and displayed in an effective manner in the schools visited. In one or two instances, the rooms to which the program had been assigned appeared less than adequate, although in each of these instances they were as good or better than other facilities at that school site. In these instances, the rooms lacked appropriate ventilation, had poor lighting and an ineffective partition from adjoining halls and classrooms.

2.4 Materials and Equipment: Materials and equipment observed were plentiful and appeared appropriate to the needs of pupils in the program. It is clear that care had been taken so that materials were carefully distributed and available to all teachers in the program. While some teachers indicated that materials had arrived late, this problem cannot be attributed to the program administration but rather to such factors as Title I approval dates and certain difficulties associated with getting purchase orders to companies and a response on the part of the companies to those orders.

An extremely interesting and effective technique, which was developed during the prior year and implemented again during the current year, sponsors the most effective use of materials in the course of the program. This technique, an exchange and storage facility, enables teachers to bring materials which they are less likely to use and exchange materials with other teachers who may desire these materials. The teachers

were enormously enthusiastic about the storage site exchange method and this method has interesting appeal and promise for other programs funded under Title I.

2.5 Instruction: As indicated, all twenty sites were observed both pre and post. During each visit, a minimum of two and sometimes as many as four observations were made. Teachers, for the most part, had worked in the program during previous years. The vast majority of teachers were clearly competent in their area. Emphasis was placed on small group instruction and, where a paraprofessional was present, instruction was individualized by the paraprofessional. In ninety percent of classes observed, the group of pupils varied from three to eight children. In two of the program sites, the group was considerably larger than called for by guidelines. In one of these two sites, the program person was clearly capable of handling this class size in a creative and effective fashion and indicated a preference for handling more than eight children at any point in time. At the other site, where more than eight children were observed at a single session, it was clear that some pressures were experienced to accept more children into the program than indicated in the guidelines. At this site, the teacher was not effective in handling such a large group. Throughout the program, teachers appeared extremely knowledgeable with respect to program guidelines, methods of diagnosis and utilization of materials. Children appeared to be highly motivated, enjoying their work and teachers provided these pupils with immediate feedback, positive reinforcement and, in most instances, with warmth and outgoing affection. With few exceptions, teachers in the program interacted extremely well with their pupils and appeared to genuinely like them and what they were doing. In those classes where a paraprofessional was present, the instructional process showed evidence of planning and effective utilization of both parties.

The paraprofessional had a role which related to individualized instruction, preparation of materials, and the reinforcement of learning experiences for children in the classroom. The relationship between the teacher and paraprofessional appeared to be one of mutual respect and awareness of what each was to do in the program.

2.6 Pupil Participants: The program was designed to service the needs of children in grades kindergarten through twelve. Over fifty percent of the pupils in the program were in grades kindergarten, one and two. At each of the program sites, the administrators seemed to have definite preference for servicing children at these grade levels and in these age categories. This preference appears to stem not only from manifest need but also from ease of program implementation. Since the program is basically of a pullout nature, it produces less disruption for children in the early childhood grades as compared with those in the later elementary and intermediate grades. Program personnel made every effort to reduce disruption caused by pullout for those children in upper grades, but they nevertheless realized that to completely avoid such disruption was not possible.

The children in the program were predominately of Hispanic origin. The program also serves children of Italian, Greek, Hebrew, French and Creole extraction.

Pupils in the program appeared to welcome their participation in the Title I ESL component. With few exceptions, pupils were attentive, appeared heavily involved, highly motivated and had good relationships with the ESL teachers. In those sites where this consultant had an opportunity to observe the same children on a pre and post basis, numerous gains were found not only in the child's English language proficiency, but also in areas such as personal self-confidence and interactions with peers

and teachers.

2.7 Supervision and Training: Program personnel received orientation prior to the initiation of the program. In addition, there were regular monthly meetings with supervisors and other teachers from schools in a geographic area. These meetings were held at the storage exchange sites where, as indicated earlier, teachers had an opportunity to bring any materials they were not planning to utilize and exchange these materials for those that they might.

The program coordinator had large group staff meetings periodically and supervisors met with teachers on an ongoing basis during the program year. Consultants were brought into discuss various aspects of ESL and teachers agreed that this was an extremely valuable component.

Another area of training which was found to be enormously helpful by the program staff was the intervisitations. Without exception, teachers mentioned these as providing a critical link between program personnel and sites. Teachers requested that additional intervisitations be made available, if possible, during the following year.

Recommendations 1974-1975

During the 1974/1975 school year, a number of recommendations were made with regard to the program. The first recommendation suggested publishing the ESL program throughout all the Title I nonpublic schools so that the principals and staff could be better informed of the goals and techniques of ESL before they were required to fill their requests for services. While the program has made efforts directed to attaining this goal, these efforts must be expanded. It should be noted that, with few exceptions, principals requested more services than they received. While the program would like to make more services available, there are limitations imposed by the size of funding available and by the fact that, while costs have increased, the magnitude of funding has remained relatively the same.

The second recommendation made during the 1974/1975 year suggested that closer contact be established between ESL teachers and regular classroom teachers in order to achieve a better understanding concerning the needs of the students and how they may be attained. While this recommendation has been worked on, it continues to be achieved along informal lines. Those ESL teachers who are back in the same school for a second year have established contacts with the regular classroom staff through informal meetings and through regular staff meetings when they are in the school. Nevertheless, in many sites visited, no systematic and formal process had been developed whereby the ESL teacher could apprise the regular school staff of program guidelines, objectives and methods.

The third recommendation suggested during the 1974/1975 year was that all ESL teachers utilize materials and machines as a integral part of the program. The program supervisors and coordinator have made special efforts to achieve this goal. It is clear that teachers were aware of how to use materials and that workshops had taken place over the course of the year directed at achieving this end.

The fourth recommendation suggested assisting ESL teachers in the more specific diagnosis of individual pupil needs and in the development of prescriptions to meet these needs. A review of plan books and interviews with teachers suggested that efforts had been made and these efforts were successful in achieving this goal.

Other recommendations made during the 1974/1975 year included the increase in the number of intervisitations among program staff and within the limits of practicality this objective was attained.

Another recommendation related to increasing the number of schools receiving five day service. While this recommendation is important, it is questionable as to whether it can be implemented within the limitations of funding.

Summary of Major Findings

Test REsults: Analysis of pre/post-test scores on both the Test of Basic Experiences and the Stanford Achievement Test Total Auditory Test demonstrated that participants at all grade levels made statistically significant gains. These gains ranged from four to eight months for pupils in grades one through nine, and twelve months for pupils in grades ten, eleven and twelve. In every

instance, the t test for correlated samples showed significance beyond the .05 level.

The program was fully coordinated and implemented in all the schools which received services. On the whole, facilities were good, the rooms were attractively decorated, materials were plentiful and readily accessible. Almost without exception, the staff observed was competent in the subject area, highly motivated and demonstrated warmth, concern and interest in their jobs. Materials and equipment were utilized and teachers demonstrated a knowledge and understanding of equipment use. The availability of the storage exchange site maximized the opportunities for teachers to bring in materials which had a low level of utilization and to obtain other materials which they could actively utilize. The staff agreed unanimously on the value of intervisitations and demonstrated a desire for this aspect of the program to be continued and possibly expanded.

The staff was also enthusiastic with regard to the exposure to consultants and the purposes of learning more about the specific aspects of ESL. In general, the staff felt that their training and orientation have been effective and that the program had done a great deal to provide them with the experience of membership in an ongoing group. The staff was familiar with the guidelines and clear with respect to the implementation of these guidelines. In most instances, where possible, the staff had implemented recommendations made during the prior year.

Conclusions

The ESL program was extremely impressive and appeared to be effective both in implementation and outcome. Teachers by and large provide small group and, where paraprofessionals were available, individualized instruction to non-English speaking pupils with the objective of improving their fluency and competency within the English language. The program's success is largely a consequence of the enthusiasm with which it is received by the operating schools and coordinated and implemented by the administration and program staff. The program has had continuity with respect to its coordination, supervision and instructional personnel.

Recommendations 1975-1976

The ESL program is highly effective and should definitely be continued. This consultant was impressed by the manifest needs observed with respect to program participants during his pre-visits to school sites. If at all possible and, if funding sources permit, the program should be expanded to include five days of instruction at the majority of school sites.

1. A formal process should be established, where possible, to enable ESL teachers to provide the regular school staff with an understanding of the program guidelines, objectives, methods and diagnosis. While teachers at the operating sites are frequently aware of the program and its guidelines, this awareness often stems from information derived informally from the program staff.

2. A formal process should be established whereby program staff meets regularly with teachers of children participating in the program. These meetings would be directed to providing and exchanging information and enabling the classroom teacher to reinforce language skills developed during the child's participation in the ESL program as well as allowing the program to reinforce skills being developed in the regular classroom setting. While such activities are currently taking place, they are being conducted on an informal and less than systematic basis and, to some extent, is determined by the ESL teacher's relationship to other teachers in the school.

3. Parents of children participating in the program should be formally notified of their child's participation and of the ESL teacher's availability for meeting with parents. In some schools, it was clear that parents had not been informed of their child's participation. Such lack of information has produced difficulties in certain instances with respect to the child's continued involvement in the program. At some schools, ESL teachers had met with parents, while in others it was clear that they had not and could not unless parents were aware of their child's participation in the program. Such meetings and workshops could benefit both the parent, the child and the program.

4. The intervisitations should be continued and, where possible, expanded. This aspect of the program proved to be enormously successful and provided program staff with an opportunity to observe

other members of the program in action and program implementation at other sites.

5. The storage exchange site should be continued and, where possible, expanded. This aspect of the program could very well serve as a model to other funded programs of a similar nature.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #_____

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) %	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
61422000	720	kg	Tobe 72 Prim	364	323	41	11.3	Moved away /withdrawn from program	41
								Missing pre or post-tests	
61423000	720	1	Tobe 72 Prim	1012	943	69	6.8	Moved away/withdrawn from program	69
								Missing pre or post-tests	
61423000	720	1-	SAT 74 Prim	54	46	8	14.8	Moved away/withdrawn from program	8
								Missing pre or post-tests	
6142300	720	2-3	SAT 74 Prim	998	924	74	7.4	Moved/withdrawn from program	74
								Missing pre or post-tests	
61424000	720	4-6	SAT 74 Prim	802	748	54	6.7	Withdrawn from program	54
								Test Data Unusable	

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

21

22

3/75

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #_____

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 1 4 2 5 0 0	7 2 0	7-9	SAT 74 Int	237	214	23	9.7	Withdrawn from program	23
								Missing pre or post-tests	
6 1 4 2 6 0 0	7 2 0	10-12	SAT 74 Int	37	35	2	5.4		
								Missing post-tests	2

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

23

24

3/7

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: 300000 | 76 | 003 | 00

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): 0969629

Project Title Nonpublic School English As a Second Language

School District Name Central Board

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Martin Weitzner

Title Consultant

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 391-1711

Date this form was completed 6 / 15 / 76.

Table 11 Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form Pre	Form Post	Level Pre	Level Post	Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	N 4/	Score Type 5/	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D. 6/	Posttest Date	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D. 6/	Statistical Data Test 7/	Statistical Data Value 8/	p Value
6142200	720	TOBE 72	L	L	Prim	Prim	364	Kg	323	6	9/75	9.4	4.9	4/76	15.1	6.2	t	15.36	.01
6142300	720	TOBE 72	L	L	Prim	Prim	1012	1	943	6	9/75	15.36	7.1	4/76	21.8	9.8	t	39.48	.01
6142300	720	SAT 74	A	B	Prim	Prim	54	1	46	1	9/75	0.7	.42	4/76	1.11	.65	t	2.93	.05
6142300	720	SAT 74	A	B	Prim	Prim	998)	2-3	924	1	9/75	1.23	.71	4/76	1.78	.93	t	33.59	.01
6142400	720	SAT 74	A	B	Prim	Prim	802	4-6	748	1	9/75	1.94	1.6	4/76	2.67	1.46	t	36.19	.01
6142500	720	SAT 74	A	B	Int.	Int.	237	7-9	214	1	9/75	2.46	1.34	4/76	3.24	1.72	t	10.67	.01
6142600	720	SAT 74	A	B	Int.	Int.	37	10-12	35	1	9/75	3.96	1.88	4/76	5.16	2.93	t	3.82	.01

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70; etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g. F=13)

While the program was originally designed to serve 2981 pupils, grades K through 12, the total number of students receiving services was 3504. Of this number a total of 3233 were both pre and post-tested.

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The Nonpublic School ESL Program was operated in 89 schools and served over three thousand pupils. The program was fully implemented and operated in accordance with the guidelines. The staff was knowledgeable and conscientious. Supplies were plentiful and appropriate to the needs of program participants. Pupils in the program appeared interested, involved and, over the course of the program participation, demonstrated observed gains in English language proficiency.

The program administrators provided ongoing training which tied the various program elements together. In addition, the operation of an exchange center provided teachers with an opportunity to become familiar with a wide array of materials and to exchange materials which were not specifically appropriate for their students with those which were.

The principals at each of the program sites were pleased with the program's impact upon participating pupils and, in each instance, hoped that their schools could be the recipient of additional ESL services in subsequent years.

Test results for participating pupils demonstrated that students at all grade levels experienced statistically significant gains.

This program is highly successful and should be recycled.